

Common origin of no-cloning and no-deleting principles - Conservation of information

Michał Horodecki¹, Ryszard Horodecki¹, Aditi Sen(De)^{1,2}, and Ujjwal Sen^{1,2}

¹*Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, University of Gdańsk, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland*

²*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Hannover, D-30167 Hannover, Germany*

We discuss the role of the notion of information in the description of physical reality. We consider theories for which dynamics is linear with respect to stochastic mixing. We point out that the no-cloning and no-deleting principles emerge in any such theory, if law of conservation of information is valid, and two copies contain more information than one copy. We then describe the quantum case from this point of view.

This paper is dedicated to Asher Peres on the occasion of his seventieth birthday.

The fact that Nature allows us to describe itself mathematically, seems even more astonishing than the laws of Nature themselves. In particular, quantum formalism is enigma, which in spirit of Gödel's theorem can not be explained by itself. The lack of clear relation between the description and reality, brings about difficulties in the interpretation of quantum formalism. As one knows, any attempt of objectivisation of the latter leads to a number of paradoxes [1]. This gap between formalism and reality has, in particular, its reflection in Asher Peres's phrase: "the physics is what physicists do in laboratories" [1] and "entanglement is a trick the quantum magicians use to produce phenomena, that can not be imitated by classical magicians" [2]. But again, why quantum magicians are better than their classical counterparts? This question forces us to adopt the primitive notions which are autonomic with respect to the formalism. In this context two notions seem to be relevant: information and informational isomorphism [3].

The recent discoveries [4, 5, 6, 7, 8] concerning processing of information in the quantum regime [9] convince us more and more that Landauer's slogan, "Information is physical!" [10], is not empty [11]. The idea that the notion of information should be regarded as a fundamental ingredient in a physical theory was proposed in different contexts [12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. However it is not quite clear, what the term "physical" means, in the above context. In fact, there are two opposing pictures of information: i) subjective, according to which information represents *knowledge*, ii) objective, which treats information (just like energy) as a *property* of the physical system. This cognitive duality can be surmounted by postulating that any consistent description of Nature, is a sort of isomorphism between the laws of Nature and their mathematical representation. According to this view [3] (called informational isomorphism), although no notion itself is reality, yet it reflects physical reality. Then any theoretical structure, although is not a real thing, is an isomorphic image of the existing reality. In this sense, information can be treated as physical, and it is natural to ask: What are the fundamental consequences of such statement? The problem is by no means trivial, as it concerns the properties of the quantity that we regard

as physical, which nevertheless, manifests itself in a way that is far from intuition.

One of the basic properties that a physical quantity can exhibit is conservation of the quantity under some physical process. Historically, the principles of conservation played a central role in the development of the modern physics on both the classical and quantum levels of the description of physical reality. For example, Pauli discovered neutrino in the beta-decay process, basing only on the conservation of energy-momentum. By analogy, it is reasonable to postulate the conservation of information as a principle, and raise it up to a paramount law of nature. In this paper we adopt this view and investigate its consequences, in the context of processing of classical and quantum information. We will consider any theory for which the dynamics is linear with respect to stochastic mixing. We point out that the no-cloning and no-deleting principles emerge in any such theory, if the law of conservation of information is valid, and two copies contain more information than one copy. We then describe the quantum case from this point of view, using von Neumann entropy as a measure of information.

We should emphasise here, that we do not want to derive the no-cloning and no-deleting theorems from unitarity. This has already been done, and is not the purpose of our paper. Rather, we would like to present a proof, that will separate the argument into two parts: i) the part independent of quantum mechanics, referring solely to conservation of a physical quantity (which is information), and ii) the quantum mechanical part, where the quantum mechanical information is evaluated.

To explain the relevance of such an approach, let us recall the principle of conservation of energy. The principle of conservation of energy was discovered in the XIX century, in the context of trials to build a *perpetuum mobile*. The principle was thus born on the ground of classical physics. But it remains a fundamental principle in quantum physics. The notion of energy and its conservation survived the revolutions in physics - both from classical to quantum, and from Galilean to relativistic. Thus this notion seems to be more fundamental than specific theories, and it is treated as a basic property of physical systems. It is therefore good to understand some

phenomena solely on the ground of a principle, such as energy conservation, rather than to derive them within some theory.

The aim of this paper is to tilt our understanding of no-cloning and no-deleting theorems in a similar direction, but with respect to *information*. We will simply state that one cannot clone or delete, in any theory if two copies have more information than one copy in that theory. Then we check that it is the case in quantum mechanics, unlike in classical world, where two copies represent exactly the same amount of information.

Let us first specifically state what we assume about the operations that can be performed over a physical system:

- (i) Enlargement of the system is allowed. I.e. addition of another system (containing no information about the original system) is allowed;
- (ii) The dynamics of the closed system is linear with respect to stochastic mixing. I.e. the dynamics is linear over the stochastic mixture $\varrho = \sum_i p_i \varrho_i$ of an ensemble $\{p_i, \varrho_i\}$.

(An ensemble $\{p_i, \varrho_i\}$ denotes a source producing a state ϱ_i with probability p_i .)

To obtain no-cloning and no-deleting from the law of conservation of information, we ask the following question: In a given physical system, is there a difference between the information content in a single copy with respect to that in two copies?

In a cloning process, we produce two copies of the input. Additionally there can be some “garbage” produced in the output. We may discard this additional part into the environment. If in a cloning process, this output (two copies plus possible garbage) has more information than the input (single copy), then we have a violation of the law of conservation of information.

In a deleting process, we do not allow additional garbage to be produced in the environment. So if two copies have more information than a single copy, we have no-deleting implied by the law of conservation of information.

Note that it is natural that we do not allow discarding part of the system (the “garbage”), as a valid operation in considerations of no-deleting. When we are trying to show that reducing information from the system is not possible, we cannot afford to be “careless” and allow throwing out parts of the system. On the other hand, in considerations with no-cloning, when we are trying to show that production of information in a system is not possible, we must allow discarding. After all, throwing out part of a system cannot *produce* information.

We therefore have built certain notions, which are *independent of any theory*. The cause of no-cloning and no-deleting follows from some principles, and whether or not two copies and one copy have the same information content.

If the two quantities (information content of two copies and that of a single copy) differ in some theory, then we will have no-cloning and no-deleting in such a theory.

Now whether two copies and one copy actually *have* the same information content, depends on specific theories.

In the classical case (i.e. when the underlying physical system consists of only distinguishable objects), two copies and one copy have the same information content. Suppose that a source will produce 0 if a certain team wins in a certain match. It produces 1 otherwise. This source is *equally informative* as a source producing 00 for “win”, and 11 otherwise. Here 0 and 1 are (classical) binary digits, encoded as two distinguishable objects (black and white balls, for example).

Below we see that in the quantum case, these quantities (information content of two copies and that of a single copy) are in general different, proving that one cannot clone or delete in this case. Specifically, in the quantum case, two copies will be seen to contain more information! Here by “quantum case”, we only assume that there exist objects which are not perfectly distinguishable, and that they form a Hilbert space. We do not assume anything about the dynamics of this “quantum case”, except what is given by item (ii) above. Specifically, we assume that any dynamics Λ takes the stochastic mixture $\sum_i p_i \varrho_i$ into $\sum_i p_i \Lambda(\varrho_i)$. Note that there is nothing “quantum” about this notion of linearity. Such linearity is assumed, for example, in classical mechanics and classical electrodynamics.

To proceed, we must now obtain some numbers, the information contents of single copy and two copies, and compare them. So we must now define what we mean by information. It is well known that under certain natural axioms, one obtains entropy as a measure of information.

Let us recall briefly no-cloning and no-deleting statements. Given a state from two (nonidentical) nonorthogonal states $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$, $\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle \neq 0, 1$ one cannot have

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_1\rangle |0\rangle &\rightarrow |\psi_1\rangle |\psi_1\rangle, \\ |\psi_2\rangle |0\rangle &\rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle |\psi_2\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

even for open systems. (A physical system is said to be open, if discarding part of the system is allowed along with (i), and (ii) stated above.) This is called no-cloning. Considering the environment inside the dynamics, this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_1\rangle |0\rangle |0\rangle_E &\rightarrow |\psi_1\rangle |\psi_1\rangle |e_{\psi_1}\rangle_E, \\ |\psi_2\rangle |0\rangle |0\rangle_E &\rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle |\psi_2\rangle |e_{\psi_2}\rangle_E, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

is not possible by a single evolution.

Assuming a unitary dynamics, this statement can be proven. This was done in Refs. [17, 18, 19], and was called the no-cloning *theorem*. (Wigner was probably the first, who considered the cloning problem within the quantum formalism [20].)

Further, the evolution

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_1\rangle |\psi_1\rangle &\rightarrow |\psi_1\rangle |0\rangle, \\ |\psi_2\rangle |\psi_2\rangle &\rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle |0\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

is not possible for closed systems, where $\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle \neq 0, 1$. (A physical system is called closed if we are not allowed to discard a part of the physical system.) This is called no-deleting.

Again the above statement of no-deleting can be proven as a theorem, by assuming a unitary evolution and was called the no-deleting *theorem* [21, 22]. Note that from a formal point of view, it is not clear whether there is any common physical origin of the above theorems or a relationship between them.

In the following, we raise both the no-cloning and no-deleting theorems to principles. In particular, we do not assume that the dynamics is unitary.

We will now show that in physical systems (as specified before),

1. Conservation of information (actually, no-*increase* of information) implies the no-cloning principle.
2. Conservation of information (actually, no-*decrease* of information) implies the no-deleting principle.

In the first implication, we allow discarding part of the system (tracing out) as a valid operation.

We will first show that the no-cloning principle is implied by the law of conservation of information. We will prove this by contradiction. Suppose therefore that cloning is possible. That is, the transformation in eq. (2) is possible. Then the average input and output states are respectively

$$\varrho_{in} = \frac{1}{2}(|\psi_1\rangle|0\rangle\langle 0|\langle\psi_1| + |\psi_2\rangle|0\rangle\langle 0|\langle\psi_2|), \quad (4)$$

and

$$\varrho_{out} = \frac{1}{2}(|\psi_1\rangle|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| + |\psi_2\rangle|\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|), \quad (5)$$

where $\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle \neq 0, 1$. Since

$$|\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle| > |\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|^2, \quad (6)$$

the von Neumann entropy of the average initial state ϱ_{in} is less than that of the average output state ϱ_{out} , thus obtaining a violation of the law of conservation of information. (The von Neumann entropy of a state ϱ , denoted as $S(\varrho)$, is defined to be $-\text{tr} \varrho \log_2 \varrho$.)

We have therefore obtained that if cloning were possible, a single copy (on average) has less information than that in two copies. Note here the crucial importance of the quantum nature (nonorthogonality) of the inputs. For classical inputs (orthogonal states), two copies have the same information as in a single copy. The situation is similar for deleting, as we will see now.

We will now show that no-deleting principle is implied by the conservation of information, in particular, no-decrease of entropy.

Suppose that deletion is possible. Then one can effect the following evolution (call it the “deleting evolution”)

in a closed system, for $\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle \neq 0, 1$ and a standard state $|0\rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_1\rangle|\psi_1\rangle &\rightarrow |\psi_1\rangle|0\rangle, \\ |\psi_2\rangle|\psi_2\rangle &\rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle|0\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Now $|\psi_1\rangle|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle|\psi_2\rangle$ are farther apart than $|\psi_1\rangle|0\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle|0\rangle$ and consequently the average input state $\frac{1}{2}(|\psi_1\rangle|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| + |\psi_2\rangle|\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|)$ has more von Neumann entropy than the average output state $\frac{1}{2}(|\psi_1\rangle|0\rangle\langle 0| + |\psi_2\rangle|0\rangle\langle 0|)$. So we obtain a violation of the law of conservation of information. In other words, conservation of information implies the no-deletion principle.

One may also see deletion in the following way (which is again not possible under unitary dynamics [22]):

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_1\rangle|\psi_1\rangle &\rightarrow |\psi_1\rangle|a_{\psi_1}\rangle, \\ |\psi_2\rangle|\psi_2\rangle &\rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle|a_{\psi_2}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle \neq 0, 1$, and $|a_{\psi_1}\rangle$ and $|a_{\psi_2}\rangle$ are nearer than $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$. That is, $|\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle| < |\langle a_{\psi_1}|a_{\psi_2}\rangle|$. Again we see that the average input state $\frac{1}{2}(|\psi_1\rangle|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| + |\psi_2\rangle|\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|)$ has more von Neumann entropy than the average output state $\frac{1}{2}(|\psi_1\rangle|a_{\psi_1}\rangle\langle a_{\psi_1}| + |\psi_2\rangle|a_{\psi_2}\rangle\langle a_{\psi_2}|)$.

Therefore whatever is the form of the deleting principle, it violates the law of conservation of information.

Let us add here that it is conceivable that suitably extended forms of the no-cloning and no-deleting principles would imply information conservation principle.

In conclusion, we have shown that any theory for which dynamics is linear with respect to stochastic mixing, the no-cloning and no-deleting principles follow from the law of conservation of information, and from whether two copies contain a different amount of information than a single copy. In particular, this result allows us to understand the physical reason for which perfect cloning or deleting are impossible. They are forbidden because they infringe a principle of conservation of information. Classically, two copies and one copy contain the same information. However in the quantum case, these information contents are generically different, putting restrictions on cloning and deleting processes.

In this context one can ask: What is the quantum formalism about? What laws are encoded in it? Our result supports the view that the quantum formalism is just about information, which however is governed by some specific constraints, making it more robust under processing. In this spirit, one can consider the *laws of Nature as constraints* on processing of information. These constraints have, in particular, their reflection in the properties of the classical [23] and quantum information measures [24, 25, 26].

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Robert Alicki for comments and Paweł and Karol Horodecki for discussions. This work is supported by the BW grant of the University of Gdańsk

and the Polish Ministry of Scientific Research and Information Technology under the (solicited) grant No PBZ-Min-008/P03/2003, and EC grants RESQ Contract No.

IST-2001-37559 and QUPRODIS Contract No. IST-2001-38877. A.S. and U.S. also acknowledge support from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

-
- [1] A. Peres *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer, Dordrecht 1993).
 - [2] see in D. Bruss *J. Math. Phys.* **43**, 4237 (2002).
 - [3] R. Horodecki, M. Horodecki and P. Horodecki *IBM Journal Research and Development* **48**, 139 (2004). (available at website www.research.ibm.com/journal/rd48-1.html)
 - [4] C.H. Bennett and G. Brassard in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing*, Bangalore, India, 1984 (IEEE Computer Society Press, New York, 1984), p.175.
 - [5] A. Peres and W. K. Wootters *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 1119 (1991).
 - [6] A. K. Ekert *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661 (1991).
 - [7] C.H. Bennett and S. Wiesner *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 20 (1992).
 - [8] C.H. Bennett G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres and W. K. Wootters *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895 (1993).
 - [9] See the fascinating story about the discovery of quantum teleportation (A. Peres *IBM J. Research and Development* **48**, 63 (2004)). There is another story about the discovery of a connection between positive maps and entanglement which has its origin in the Peres partial transposition criterion, A. Peres *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 1413 (1996).
 - [10] R. Landauer, *Physics Today* **44(5)**, 22 (1991).
 - [11] See the experimental realizations of H. Weinfurter and A. Zeilinger "Quantum Communication" in G. Alber et al. *Quantum Information* Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, 2001, p. 58.
 - [12] R. Horodecki, in Proceedings of the Int. Conf. on Problems in Quantum Physics: Gdansk'89, *World Scientific Publishers. Singapore 1990* p.346 ; R. Horodecki *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* **48**, 479 (1991).
 - [13] M. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Lett. A* **244**, 473 (1998).
 - [14] A. Zeilinger, *Found. Phys.* **29**, 631 (1999).
 - [15] R. Horodecki, M. Horodecki and P. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 022310 (2001).
 - [16] R. Jozsa *IBM J. Research and Development* **48**, 79 (2004).
 - [17] W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek, *Nature* **299**, 802 (1982).
 - [18] D. Dieks, *Phys. Lett. A* **92**, 271 (1982).
 - [19] H. P. Yuen *Phys. Lett. A* **113**, 405 (1986).
 - [20] E. P. Wigner *The Logic of Personal Knowledge. Essays in Honor of Michael Polanyi*, (London, 1961, ch. 19), see in *Symmetries and Reflections* (Indian University Press, Bloomington-London 1970).
 - [21] A. K. Pati and S.L. Braunstein, *Nature* **404**, 164 (2000).
 - [22] A. K. Pati and S.L. Braunstein, Quantum no-deleting principle and some of its implications <http://arXiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0007121>.
 - [23] C. E. Shannon *Bell System Tech. J.* **27**, 379 and 623 (1948).
 - [24] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 062104 (2003).
 - [25] M. Horodecki, K. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, A. Sen(De), and U. Sen *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 100402 (2003).
 - [26] N. Linden and A. Winter, A new inequality for the von Neumann entropy <http://arXiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0406162>